



STALLMAN & POLLOCK LLP 353 Sacramento Street, Suite 2200 San Francisco, CA 94111 (415) 772-4900

In re Patent Application of: Kenneth C. Johnson et al.

Atty Docket No. TWI-30510

Application No.: 10/777,353

Filed: February 12, 2004 Confirmation No.: 5063

For:

DATABASE INTERPOLATION METHOD FOR OPTICAL MEASUREMENT OF DIFFRACTIVE

MICROSTRUCTURES

M/S AMENDMENT Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Transmittal herewith is an amendment in the above-identified application.

The fee has been calculated as shown below.

	CLAIMS		HIGHEST NO.	PRESENT	RATE	ADDITIONAL
	REMAINING		PREVIOUSLY	EXTRA		FEE
	AFTER	}	PAID FOR			
	AMENDMENT				l	
TOTAL	10	MINUS	20	0	x \$50 =	\$0
INDEP.	2	MINUS	3	0	x \$200 =	\$0
FIRST PRE	SENTATION OF MU	+ \$360	\$0			
					TOTAL	0.2

Small Entity 50% Filing Fee Reduction (if applicable)

\$0

	**	If the entry in Col. 1 is less than the entry in Col. 2, write "0" in Col. 3 If the "Highest Number Previously Paid For" IN THIS SPACE is less than 20, write "20" in this space. If the "Highest Number Previously Paid For" IN THIS SPACE is less than 3, write "3" in this space. The "Highest Number Previously Paid For" (Total or Independent is the highest number found from the equivalent box in Col. 1 of			
		prior amendment or the number of claims originally filed.)			
1.	\boxtimes	No additional fee is required.			
2.		A check in the amount of \$ is attached.			
3.		Please charge any additional fees, including any fees necessary for extensions of time or cred overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1703, under Order No. TWI-30510. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.			
4.		Petition for extension of time. The undersigned attorney of record hereby petitions for an extension of time pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), as may be required, to file this response.			
		STALLMAN & POLLOCK LLP			

2005 Michael A. Stallman (Reg. No. 29,444) Attorneys for Applicant(s)

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on March 3, 2005.

Dated:	03-03-2005	By:
		Tanisha Lawrence-Caceres



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of

Kenneth C. Johnson et al.

Application No.: 10/777,353

Filed: February 12, 2004

For: DATABASE INTERPOLATION METHOD FOR OPTICAL MEASUREMENT OF DIFFRACTIVE MICROSTRUCTURES Confirmation No.: 5063

Group Art Unit: 2857

Examiner: Carol S.W. Tsai

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION MAILED DECEMBER 13, 2004

353 Sacramento Street, Suite 2200 San Francisco, CA 94111 Telephone: (415) 772-4900

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope, addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on Way 10.305 STALLMAN & POLLOCK LLP

Dated: 03-03-005 Bv:

Tanisha Lawrence-Caceres

M/S AMENDMENT Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Office Action dated December 13, 2004, Applicants request reconsideration for the following reasons:

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-10 based on the patent to Maris (5,844,684) in view of Maris (6,211,921).

In the previous Office Action (dated July 22, 2004), the Examiner relied on the same two patents to reject the claims. In their previous response, applicants pointed out that while the Maris references disclose the general concept of "interpolation," they failed to teach or suggest "an interpolation model that defines a substantially continuous function which intersects with the interpolation points." This concept is found in applicants' pending independent claims 1 and 5.

In the pending Office Action, the Examiner disagreed with the applicants. In support of her position, the Examiner referred to a statement in applicants' specification at page 8,m line 23

Atty Docket No.: TWI-30510